



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/656,917	09/05/2003	Brian Axe	16113-768001 / GP-143-00-	8377
26192	7590	10/29/2008	EXAMINER	
FISH & RICHARDSON P.C. PO BOX 1022 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55440-1022			BROWN, ALVIN L	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3622	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			10/29/2008	ELECTRONIC

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

PATDOCTC@fr.com

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/656,917	<b>Applicant(s)</b> AXE ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> ALVIN L. BROWN	<b>Art Unit</b> 3622	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 September 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,5-15,17-52,56-66 and 68-103 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,5-15,17-52,56-66 and 68-103 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)          | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. Claims 2-4, 16, 53-55, 67 have been canceled. Claims 1, 5-15, 17-52, 56-66, 68-103 have been examined.

### ***Response to Amendment***

2. The amendment filed on August 19, 2008 is sufficient to overcome the prior art rejection. A new reference has been added to the 35 USC 103 rejection.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101***

3. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

4. Claims 1, 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Based on Supreme Court precedent, a method/process claim must (1) be tied to another statutory class of invention (such as a particular apparatus) (see at least *Diamond v. Diehr*, 450 U.S. 175, 184 (1981); *Parker v. Flook*, 437 U.S. 584, 588 n.9 (1978); *Gottschalk v. Benson*, 409 U.S. 63, 70 (1972); *Cochrane v. Deener*, 94 U.S. 780, 787-88 (1876)) or (2) transform underlying subject matter (such as an article or materials) to a different state or thing (see at least *Gottschalk v. Benson*, 409 U.S. 63, 71 (1972)). A method/process claim that fails to meet one of the above requirements is not in compliance with the statutory requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101 for patent eligible subject matter. Here the claims fails to meet the above requirements because the steps are neither tied to another statutory class of invention (such as a particular apparatus) nor physically transform underlying subject matter (such as an article or materials) to a different state or thing.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 3622

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

**6. Claims 1, 5-15, 17-26, 28, 30-52, 56-66, 68-77, 79, 81-103 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Boylan, III et al. (US 6,799,326 B2) in view of Dedrick (5,724,521).**

**As per claims 1 and 52**, Boylan discloses a method for blocking advertisements, the method comprising:

accepting user input indicating at least one category of ads to be blocked (Figure 18; Column 1, lines 25-35; Column 11, lines 30-45);

accepting user input requesting content that includes at least one ad, an ad being associated with at least one category (Figure 21; Column 1, lines 25-35; column 11, lines 46-55; column 12, line 59 – column 13, line 9); and

Boylan further discloses preventing an ad from being served if at least a predetermined number of its associated categories match a category of ads to be blocked (Figure 18).

Boylan does not explicitly disclose a document linked to by an ad.

However, Dedrick discloses a document linked by an ad (column 2, lines 10-20).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to add Dedrick's document linked to an ad to Boylan's blocked advertisement. One would be motivated to do this in order to block advertisement based on content during a search session.

**As per claims 28, and 79**, Boylan further discloses the category is a semantic cluster (column 11, line 55 - column 12, line 3).

**As per claims 30 and 81**, Boylan further discloses the category is a concept (column 11, lines 30-45).

**As per claims 5 and 56**, Boylan further discloses the act of preventing an ad from being served includes removing the ad from a set of eligible ads (Figure 18, #132).

**As per claims 6 and 57**, Boylan further discloses the predetermined number is one (column 11, lines 30-45).

**As per claims 7, 18-20, 32, 43-45, 58, 69, 70-71, 83, 94-96**, Boylan further discloses the category is a product category, name and manufacturer (column 11, lines 30-45).

**As per claims 8, 21-22, 33, 46-47, 59, 72-73, 84, 97-98**, Boylan further discloses the category is a service category, name and provider (column 11, lines 30-45).

**As per claims 9, 23, 34, 48, 60, 74, 85, 99**, Boylan further discloses the category of ads to be blocked is from a list associated with at least one document (column 11, line 55 – Column 12, line 3).

**As per claims 10, 24, 35, 49, 61, 75, 86, 100**, Boylan further discloses at least one document is at least one Web page (column 6, lines 53-67).

**As per claims 11, 25, 36, 50, 62, 76, 87, 101**, Boylan further discloses at least one document include Web pages of a Website (column 6, lines 53-67).

Art Unit: 3622

**As per claims 12, 26, 37, 51, 63, 77, 88, 102**, Boylan further discloses at least one document is at least one Web page associated with a path name (column 6, lines 53-67).

**As per claims 13, 38, 64, 89**, Boylan further discloses:

accepting user input indicating at least one term; and preventing an ad from being served if at least a part of its ad information includes at least a second predetermined number of any of the term (column 11, lines 30-45).

**As per claims 14, 39, 65, 90**, Boylan further discloses at least a part of the ad information is content of a creative of the ad (column 7, line 65 - column 8, line 18).

**As per claims 15, 40, 66, 91**, Boylan further discloses at least a part of the ad information is keyword targeting terms associated with the ad (column 11, lines 30 – 45).

**As per claims 41, 92**, Boylan further discloses at least a part of the ad information is content of a document linked to by the ad (column 11, lines 30 – 45).

**As per claims 17, 42, 68, 93**, Boylan further discloses the second predetermined number is one (column 11, lines 30 – 45).

**As per claims 31 and 82**, Boylan further discloses the act of adjusting a weight of the categories in a comparison function includes setting the weight to zero (column 12, lines 4-15).

**As per claims 27 and 78**, Boylan discloses:

accepting at least one category of ads to be blocked (Figure 18; Column 11, lines 30-45); and

Art Unit: 3622

accepting at least one ad, an ad being associated with at least one category (Figure 21; column 11, lines 46-55; column 12, line 59 – column 13, line 9).

Boylan does not explicitly disclose adjusting a weight of the categories in a comparison function; accepting a document being associated with at least one category; and comparing the ad with the document using the comparison function.

However, Dedrick discloses

adjusting a weight of the categories in a comparison function (column 2, lines 10-20);

accepting a document being associated with at least one category (column 2, lines 10-20); and

comparing the ad with the document using the comparison function (column 2, lines 10-20).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to add Dedrick's document linked to an ad and weighted categories to Boylan's blocked advertisement. One would be motivated to do this in order to block advertisement based on content during a search session.

**As per claim 103**, Boylan discloses computer-readable medium having embodied thereon a computer program configured to block digital advertisements, the medium comprising one or more code segments configured, when executed,

receive user input indicating a category of digital advertisements to be blocked from distribution to a viewer over the distribution network (Figure 18; Column 1, lines 25-35; Column 11, lines 30-45; Column 6, lines 30-42);

receive user input indicating a digital advertisement, the advertisement being distributed with content distributed to viewers over the distribution network (Column 5 lines 37-60; Column 6, lines 30-42); and

block a digital advertisement from distribution over the distribution network if the category associated with the digital advertisement matches the indicated category of digital advertisements to be blocked, wherein the category associated with the digital advertisement is determined from the content distributed with the digital advertisement (figure 18).

**7. Claims 29, 80 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Boylan, III et al. (US 6,799,326 B2) in view of Bangalore, Srinivas and Rambow, Owen, "Exploiting a Probabilistic Hierarchical Model for Generation. In: Proceedings of the 18th Conference on Computational Linguistics (COLING'2000), July 31 - August 4 2000.**

**As per claims 29 and 80**, Boylan discloses the claimed invention as in claims 1, 27, 52 and 78. Boylan further discloses a method of blocking advertisements by analyzing keyword in the text of the advertisement (column 11, line 61 – column 12, line 3).

Boylan does not explicitly disclose the category is a probabilistic hierarchical inferential learner cluster.

However, Bangalore teaches probabilistic hierarchical inferential learner cluster (pages 42 – 48).



Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to add Bangalore's model of examining a set of word as concepts in a query to Boylan's method of blocking advertisements. One would be motivated to do this in order to provide users with content specific advertisements.

### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments included in Remarks filed on August 19, 2008 with respect to the claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. Please see the addition of Dedrick to the independent claim rejections above.

Furthermore, Applicant argues that "there is no mention whatsoever in the cited portion of Boylan of a document linked to by ad." Examiner concedes that Boylan does not explicitly disclose a document linked to by an ad.

However, Dedrick discloses a document linked by an ad (column 2, lines 10-20).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to add Dedrick's document linked to an ad to Boylan's blocked advertisement. One would be motivated to do this in order to block advertisement based on content during a search session.

Applicant further argues that "there is no mention of adjusting a weight of a category, or a comparison function," in the cited portion of Boylan. Examiner agrees that Boylan does not explicitly disclose adjusting a weight of the categories in a comparison function neither comparing the ad with the document using the comparison function.

However, Dedrick discloses adjusting a weight of the categories in a comparison function (column 2, lines 10-20); and

comparing the ad with the document using the comparison function (column 2, lines 10-20).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to add Dedrick's weighted categories to Boylan's blocked advertisement. One would be motivated to do this in order to block advertisement based on content during a search session.

Applicant further argues that "Bangalore fails to cure the deficiencies of Boylan" in regards to probabilistic hierarchical inferential learner cluster. Examiner respectfully disagrees since Bangalore addresses the application of probabilistic hierarchical inferential learner cluster (pages 42 – 48).

### ***Conclusion***

8. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

Art Unit: 3622

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ALVIN L. BROWN whose telephone number is (571)270-5109. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday 7:30 AM to 5:00 PM Eastern Time.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Eric Stamber can be reached on 571 272 6724. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

ALB

/Arthur Duran/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3622